

# FLAVOURED MULTISKYRMIONS.

V.B.Kopeliovich\* and W.J.Zakrzewski\*\*

\**Institute for Nuclear Research of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow 117312, Russia*

\*\**Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Durham, Durham DH1 3LE, UK*

Static properties of multiskyrmions with baryon numbers up to 8 are calculated, based on the recently given rational map ansatz. The spectra of baryonic systems with strangeness, charm and bottom are considered within a "rigid oscillator" version of the bound state soliton model. It is suggested that the recently observed negatively charged nuclear fragment can be considered as a quantized strange multiskyrmion with  $B = 6$  or  $7$ . In agreement with previous observation, baryonic systems with charm or bottom have more chance to be bound by the strong interactions than strange baryonic systems.

PACS 14.20.Mr, 14.20. Lq

1. The topological soliton models, and the Skyrme model among them [1], are attractive because of their simplicity and the possibility that they may describe well various properties of low energy baryons. The models of this kind provide also a very good framework within which to investigate the possibility of the existence of nuclear matter fragments with unusual properties, such as flavour being different from  $u$  and  $d$  quarks. In addition to being important by itself, this issue can have consequences in astrophysics and cosmology. It is well known that the relativistic many-body problems cannot be solved directly using the existing methods, and the chiral soliton approach may allow to overcome some of these difficulties.

The description of skyrmions with large baryon numbers is complicated because the explicit form of the fields was not known. A recent remarkable observation [2] that the fields of the  $SU(2)$  skyrmions can be approximated accurately by rational map ansatz giving the values of masses close to their precise values, has simplified considerably their studies. Similar ansatz have also been recently presented for  $SU(N)$  skyrmions (which are not embeddings of  $SU(2)$  fields)[3].

Here we use the  $SU(2)$  rational map ansatz as the starting points for the calculation of static properties of bound states of skyrmions necessary for their quantization in the  $SU(3)$  collective coordinates space. The energy and baryon number densities of the  $B = 3$  configuration have tetrahedral symmetry, for  $B = 4$  - the octahedral (cubic) one [4], for  $B = 5$  -  $D_{2d}$ -symmetry, for  $B = 6$  -  $D_{4d}$ , for  $B = 7$  - dodecahedral symmetry, and for  $B = 8$  -  $D_{6d}$  - symmetry [5, 2], etc. The minimization, with the help of a 3-dimensional variational  $SU(3)$  program [6], lowers the energies of these configurations by few hundreds of  $MeV$  and shows that they are local minima in the  $SU(3)$  configuration space. The knowledge of the "flavour" moment of inertia and the  $\Sigma$ -term allows us then to estimate the flavour excitation energies. The mass splittings of the lowest states with different values of strangeness, charm or bottom are calculated within the rigid oscillator version of the bound state approach. The binding energies of baryonic systems ( $BS$ ) with different flavours are also estimated.

2. Let us consider simple  $SU(3)$  extensions of the Skyrme model [1]: we start with  $SU(2)$  skyrmions (with flavour corresponding to  $(u, d)$  quarks) and extend them to various  $SU(3)$  groups,  $(u, d, s)$ ,  $(u, d, c)$ , or  $(u, d, b)$ . We take the Lagrangian density of the Skyrme

model, which in its well known form depends on parameters  $F_\pi$ ,  $F_D$  and  $e$  and can be written in the following way [7]:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & \frac{F_\pi^2}{16} \text{Tr} l_\mu l^\mu + \frac{1}{32e^2} \text{Tr} [l_\mu, l_\nu]^2 + \frac{F_\pi^2 m_\pi^2}{16} \text{Tr} (U + U^\dagger - 2) + \\ & + \frac{F_D^2 m_D^2 - F_\pi^2 m_\pi^2}{24} \text{Tr} (1 - \sqrt{3} \lambda_8) (U + U^\dagger - 2) + \frac{F_D^2 - F_\pi^2}{48} \text{Tr} (1 - \sqrt{3} \lambda_8) (U l_\mu l^\mu + l_\mu l^\mu U^\dagger). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

$U \in SU(3)$  is a unitary matrix incorporating chiral (meson) fields, and  $l_\mu = U^\dagger \partial_\mu U$ . In this model  $F_\pi$  is fixed at the physical value:  $F_\pi = 186$  Mev.  $M_D$  is the mass of  $K$ ,  $D$  or  $B$  meson.

The flavour symmetry breaking ( $FSB$ ) in the Lagrangian (1) is of the usual form, and was sufficient to describe the mass splittings of the octet and decuplets of baryons [7]. The Wess-Zumino term, not shown here, plays an important role in the quantization procedure, but it does not contribute to the static masses of classical configurations [8].

We begin our calculations with  $U \in SU(2)$ , as was mentioned above. The classical mass of  $SU(2)$  solitons, in most general case, depends on 3 profile functions:  $f$ ,  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . The general parametrization of  $U_0$  for an  $SU(2)$  soliton we use here is given by  $U_0 = c_f + s_f \vec{\tau} \vec{n}$  with  $n_z = c_\alpha$ ,  $n_x = s_\alpha c_\beta$ ,  $n_y = s_\alpha s_\beta$ ,  $s_f = \sin f$ ,  $c_f = \cos f$ , etc.

The flavour moment of inertia enters directly in the procedure of quantization [9]-[17], and for arbitrary  $SU(2)$  skyrmions is given by [15, 17]:

$$\Theta_F = \frac{1}{8} \int (1 - c_f) [F_D^2 + \frac{1}{e^2} ((\vec{\partial} f)^2 + s_f^2 (\vec{\partial} \alpha)^2 + s_f^2 s_\alpha^2 (\vec{\partial} \beta)^2)] d^3 \vec{r}. \quad (2)$$

It is simply connected with  $\Theta_F^{(0)}$  for the flavour symmetric case:  $\Theta_F = \Theta_F^{(0)} + (F_D^2/F_\pi^2 - 1)\Gamma/4$ ,  $\Gamma$  is defined in (3) below. The isotopic moments of inertia are the components of the corresponding tensor of inertia [9, 10], in our case this tensor of inertia is close to unit matrix multiplied by  $\Theta_T$ . The quantities  $\Gamma$  (or  $\Sigma$ -term), which defines the contribution of the mass term to the classical mass of solitons, and  $\tilde{\Gamma}$  also are used in the quantization procedure:

$$\Gamma = \frac{F_\pi^2}{2} \int (1 - c_f) d^3 \vec{r}, \quad \tilde{\Gamma} = \frac{1}{4} \int c_f [(\vec{\partial} f)^2 + s_f^2 (\vec{\partial} \alpha)^2 + s_f^2 s_\alpha^2 (\vec{\partial} \beta)^2] d^3 \vec{r}. \quad (3)$$

The masses of solitons, moments of inertia,  $\Gamma$  and  $\tilde{\Gamma}$  are presented in the Table below.

$B$	$M_{cl}$	$\Theta_F^{(0)}$	$\Theta_T$	$\Gamma$	$\tilde{\Gamma}$	$\omega_s$	$\omega_c$	$\omega_b$	$\Delta\epsilon_s$	$\Delta\epsilon_c$	$\Delta\epsilon_b$
1	1.702	2.04	5.55	4.83	15.6	0.309	1.542	4.82	—	—	—
3	4.80	6.34	14.4	14.0	27	0.289	1.504	4.75	-0.041	-0.01	0.03
4	6.20	8.27	16.8	18.0	31	0.283	1.493	4.74	-0.020	0.019	0.06
5	7.78	10.8	23.5	23.8	35	0.287	1.505	4.75	-0.027	0.006	0.05
6	9.24	13.1	25.4	29.0	38	0.287	1.504	4.75	-0.019	0.017	0.05
7	10.6	14.7	28.7	32.3	44	0.282	1.497	4.75	-0.017	0.021	0.06
8	12.2	17.4	33.4	38.9	47	0.288	1.510	4.77	-0.018	0.014	0.02

Characteristics of the bound states of skyrmions with baryon numbers up to  $B = 8$ . The classical mass of solitons  $M_{cl}$  is in  $Gev$ , moments of inertia,  $\Gamma$  and  $\tilde{\Gamma}$  - in  $Gev^{-1}$ , the excitation frequencies for flavour  $F$ ,  $\omega_F$  in  $Gev$ . The parameters of the model  $F_\pi = 186$  Mev,  $e = 4.12$ . The accuracy of calculations is better than

1% for the masses and few % for other quantities. The  $B = 1$  quantities are shown for comparison.  $\Delta\epsilon_{s,c,b}$ , in  $\text{Gev}$ , are the changes of binding energies of lowest  $BS$  with flavour  $s$ ,  $c$  or  $b$ ,  $|F| = 1$ , in comparison with usual  $(u, d)$  nuclei (see Eq.(14)).

3. To quantize the solitons in  $SU(3)$  configuration space, in the spirit of the bound state approach to the description of strangeness proposed in [11, 12] and used in [13, 14], we consider the collective coordinates motion of the meson fields incorporated into the matrix  $U$ :

$$U(r, t) = R(t)U_0(O(t)\vec{r})R^\dagger(t), \quad R(t) = A(t)S(t), \quad (4)$$

where  $U_0$  is the  $SU(2)$  soliton embedded into  $SU(3)$  in the usual way (into the left upper corner),  $A(t) \in SU(2)$  describes  $SU(2)$  rotations,  $S(t) \in SU(3)$  describes rotations in the “strange”, “charm” or “bottom” directions, and  $O(t)$  describes rigid rotations in real space.

$$S(t) = \exp(i\mathcal{D}(t)), \quad \mathcal{D}(t) = \sum_{a=4, \dots, 7} D_a(t)\lambda_a, \quad (5)$$

$\lambda_a$  are Gell-Mann matrices of the  $(u, d, s)$ ,  $(u, d, c)$  or  $(u, d, b)$   $SU(3)$  groups. The  $(u, d, c)$  and  $(u, d, b)$   $SU(3)$  groups are quite analogous to the  $(u, d, s)$  one. For the  $(u, d, c)$  group a simple redefinition of hypercharge should be made. For the  $(u, d, s)$  group,  $D_4 = (K^+ + K^-)/\sqrt{2}$ ,  $D_5 = i(K^+ - K^-)/\sqrt{2}$ , etc. And for the  $(u, d, c)$  group  $D_4 = (D^0 + \bar{D}^0)/\sqrt{2}$ , etc.

The angular velocities of the isospin rotations are defined in the standard way:  $A^\dagger \dot{A} = -i\vec{\omega}\vec{\tau}/2$ . We shall not consider here the usual space rotations explicitly because the corresponding moments of inertia for  $BS$  are much greater than isospin moments of inertia, and for lowest possible values of angular momentum  $J$  the corresponding quantum correction is either exactly zero (for even  $B$ ), or small.

The field  $D$  is small in magnitude, at least, of order  $1/\sqrt{N_c}$ , where  $N_c$  is the number of colours in  $QCD$ . Therefore, an expansion of the matrix  $S$  in  $D$  can be made safely. To the lowest order in field  $D$  the Lagrangian of the model (1) can be written as

$$L = -M_{cl,B} + 4\Theta_{F,B}\dot{D}^\dagger \dot{D} - \left[ \Gamma_B \left( \frac{F_D^2}{F_\pi^2} m_D^2 - m_\pi^2 \right) + \tilde{\Gamma}_B (F_D^2 - F_\pi^2) \right] D^\dagger D - i \frac{N_c B}{2} (D^\dagger \dot{D} - \dot{D}^\dagger D). \quad (7)$$

Here and below  $D$  is the doublet  $K^+$ ,  $K^0$  ( $D^0$ ,  $D^-$ , or  $B^+$ ,  $B^0$ ). We have kept the standard notation for the moment of inertia of the rotation into the “flavour” direction  $\Theta_F$  for  $\Theta_s$ ,  $\Theta_c$  or  $\Theta_b$  [10, 15] (the index  $c$  denotes the charm quantum number, except in  $N_c$ ). The contribution proportional to  $\tilde{\Gamma}_B$  is suppressed in comparison with the term  $\sim \Gamma$  by the small factor  $\sim (F_D^2 - F_\pi^2)/m_D^2$ , and is more important for strangeness. The term proportional to  $N_c B$  in (7) arises from the Wess-Zumino term in the action and is responsible for the difference of the excitation energies of strangeness and antistrangeness (flavour and antiflavour in general case) [13, 14].

Following the canonical quantization procedure the Hamiltonian of the system, including the terms of the order of  $N_c^0$ , takes the form [11, 12]:

$$H_B = M_{cl,B} + \frac{1}{4\Theta_{F,B}} \Pi^\dagger \Pi + \left( \Gamma_B \bar{m}_D^2 + \tilde{\Gamma}_B (F_D^2 - F_\pi^2) + \frac{N_c^2 B^2}{16\Theta_{F,B}} \right) D^\dagger D + i \frac{N_c B}{8\Theta_{F,B}} (D^\dagger \Pi - \Pi^\dagger D). \quad (8)$$

$\bar{m}_D^2 = (F_D^2/F_\pi^2)m_D^2 - m_\pi^2$ . The momentum  $\Pi$  is canonically conjugate to variable  $D$ . Eq. (8) describes an oscillator-type motion of the field  $D$  in the background formed by the  $(u, d)$   $SU(2)$  soliton. After the diagonalization which can be done explicitly following [13, 14], the normal-ordered Hamiltonian can be written as

$$H_B = M_{cl,B} + \omega_{F,B} a^\dagger a + \bar{\omega}_{F,B} b^\dagger b + O(1/N_c), \quad (9)$$

with  $a^\dagger, b^\dagger$  being the operators of creation of strangeness, i.e., antikaons, and antistrangeness (flavour and antflavour) quantum number,  $\omega_{F,B}$  and  $\bar{\omega}_{F,B}$  being the frequencies of flavour (antiflavour) excitations.  $D$  and  $\Pi$  are connected with  $a$  and  $b$  in the following way [13, 14]:

$$D^i = (b^i + a^{\dagger i})/\sqrt{N_c B \mu_{F,B}}, \quad \Pi^i = \sqrt{N_c B \mu_{F,B}}(b^i - a^{\dagger i})/(2i) \quad (10)$$

with

$$\mu_{F,B} = [1 + 16(\bar{m}_D^2 \Gamma_B + (F_D^2 - F_\pi^2) \tilde{\Gamma}_B) \Theta_{F,B} / (N_c B)^2]^{1/2}.$$

For the lowest states the values of  $D$  are small:  $D \sim [16\Gamma_B \Theta_{F,B} \bar{m}_D^2 + N_c^2 B^2]^{-1/4}$ , and increase, with increasing flavour number  $|F|$  like  $(2|F| + 1)^{1/2}$ . As was noted in [14], deviations of the field  $D$  from the vacuum decrease with increasing mass  $m_D$ , as well as with increasing number of colours  $N_c$ , and the method works for any  $m_D$  (and also for charm and bottom quantum numbers).

The excitation frequencies  $\omega$  and  $\bar{\omega}$  are:

$$\omega_{F,B} = N_c B (\mu_{F,B} - 1) / (8\Theta_{F,B}), \quad \bar{\omega}_{F,B} = N_c B (\mu_{F,B} + 1) / (8\Theta_{F,B}). \quad (11)$$

As was observed in [15], the difference  $\bar{\omega}_{F,B} - \omega_{F,B} = N_c B / (4\Theta_{F,B})$  coincides, to the leading order in  $N_c$  with the expression obtained in the collective coordinates approach [16].

The  $FSB$  in the flavour decay constants, i.e. the fact that  $F_K/F_\pi \simeq 1.22$  and  $F_D/F_\pi = 1.7 \pm 0.2$  (we take  $F_D/F_\pi = 1.5$  and  $F_B/F_\pi = 2$ ) leads to the increase of the flavour excitation frequencies, in better agreement with data for charm and bottom [18]. It also leads to some increase of the binding energies of  $BS$  [15].

The behaviour of static characteristics of multiskyrmions and flavour excitation frequencies shown in the Table is similar to that obtained in [19] for toroidal configurations with  $B = 2, 3, 4$ . The flavour inertia increases with  $B$  almost proportionally to  $B$ . The frequencies  $\omega_F$  are smaller for  $B \geq 3$  than for  $B = 1$ .

4. The terms of the order of  $N_c^{-1}$  in the Hamiltonian, which depend on the angular velocities of rotations in the isospin and the usual space and which describe the zero-mode contributions are not crucial but important for the numerical estimates of spectra of baryonic systems.

In the rigid oscillator model the states predicted do not correspond to the definite  $SU(3)$  or  $SU(4)$  representations. How this can be remedied was shown in [14]. For example, the state with  $B = 1$ ,  $|F| = 1$ ,  $I = 0$  should belong to the octet of  $(u, d, s)$ , or  $(u, d, c)$ ,  $SU(3)$  group, if  $N_c = 3$ .

Here we consider quantized states of  $BS$  which belong to the lowest possible  $SU(3)$  irreps  $(p, q)$ ,  $p + 2q = 3B$ :  $p = 0$ ,  $q = 3B/2$  for even  $B$ , and  $p = 1$ ,  $q = (3B - 1)/2$  for odd  $B$ .

For  $B = 3, 5$  and  $7$  they are 35, 80 and 143-plets, for  $B = 4, 6$  and  $8$  - 28, 55 and 91-plets. Since we are interested in the lowest energy states, we discuss here the baryonic systems with the lowest allowed angular momentum, *ie*  $J = 0$ , for  $B = 4, 6$  and  $8$ . For odd  $B$  the quantization of  $BS$  meets some difficulties, but the correction to the energy of quantized states due to nonzero angular momentum is small and decreases with increasing  $B$  since the corresponding moment of inertia increases proportionally to  $\sim B^2$ . Moreover, the  $J$ -dependent correction to the energy cancels in the differences of energies of flavoured and flavourless states which we discuss.

For the energy difference between the state with flavour  $F$  belonging to the  $(p, q)$  irrep, and the ground state with  $F = 0$  and the same angular momentum and  $(p, q)$  we obtain:

$$\Delta E_{B,F} = |F|\omega_{F,B} + \frac{\mu_{F,B} - 1}{4\mu_{F,B}\Theta_{F,B}}[I(I+1) - T_r(T_r+1)] + \frac{(\mu_{F,B} - 1)(\mu_{F,B} - 2)}{8\mu_{F,B}^2\Theta_{F,B}}I_F(I_F+1), \quad (12)$$

$T_r = p/2$  is the quantity analogous to the “right” isospin  $T_r$ , in the collective coordinates approach [9, 10], and  $\vec{T}_r = \vec{I}_{bf} - \vec{I}_F$ . Clearly, the binding energy of multiskyrmions is cancelled in Eq. (12). For the states with maximal isospin  $I = T_r + |F|/2$  the energy difference can be simplified to:

$$\Delta E_{B,F} = |F|\left[\omega_{F,B} + T_r\frac{\mu_{F,B} - 1}{4\mu_{F,B}\Theta_{F,B}} + \frac{(|F| + 2)(\mu_{F,B} - 1)^2}{8\Theta_{F,B}\mu_{F,B}^2}\right]. \quad (13)$$

This difference depends on the flavour moment of inertia but not on  $\Theta_T$ . In the case of ant flavoured excitations we have the same formulas, with the substitution  $\mu \rightarrow -\mu$ . For even  $B$ ,  $T_r = 0$ , for odd  $B$ ,  $T_r = 1/2$  for the lowest  $SU(3)$  irreps. It follows from (12) and (13) that when some nucleons are replaced by flavoured hyperons in  $BS$  the binding energy of the system changes by

$$\Delta\epsilon_{B,F} = |F|\left[\omega_{F,1} - \omega_{F,B} - \frac{3(\mu_{F,1} - 1)}{8\mu_{F,1}^2\Theta_{F,1}} - T_r\frac{\mu_{F,B} - 1}{4\mu_{F,B}\Theta_{F,B}} - \frac{(|F| + 2)(\mu_{F,B} - 1)^2}{8\Theta_{F,B}\mu_{F,B}^2}\right] \quad (14)$$

For strangeness Eq. (14) is negative indicating that stranglets should have binding energies smaller than those of nuclei, or can be unbound. Since  $\Theta_{F,B}$  increases with increasing  $B$  and  $m_D$  this leads to the increase of binding with increasing  $B$  and mass of the “flavour”, in agreement with [15]. For charm and bottom Eq. (14) is positive for  $B \geq 3$ , see the Table for the case  $|F| = 1$ .

The nuclear fragments with sufficiently large values of strangeness (or bottom) can be found in experiments as fragments with negative charge  $Q$ , according to the well known relation  $Q = T_3 + (B + S)/2$  (similarly for the bottom number). One event of a long lived nuclear fragment with mass about  $7.4\text{GeV}$  was reported in [20]. Using the above formulas it is not difficult to establish that this fragment can be the state with  $B = -S = 6$ , or  $B = 7$  and strangeness  $S = -3$ . In view of some uncertainty of present calculation - the rigid oscillator version of the model leads to overestimation of flavour excitation energies - greater values of strangeness, by 1 or 2 units can be necessary to obtain the observed value of mass.

As in the  $B = 1$  case [21] the absolute values of masses of multiskyrmions are controlled by the poorly known loop corrections to the classic masses, or the Casimir energy. And as was done for the  $B = 2$  states, [16], the renormalization procedure is necessary to

obtain physically reasonable values of the masses. This generates an uncertainty of about several tens of *Mev*, as the binding energy of the deuteron is 30 *Mev* instead of the measured value 2.23 *Mev*, so  $\sim 30$  *Mev* characterises the uncertainty of our approach [16, 17]. But this uncertainty is cancelled in the differences of binding energies  $\Delta\epsilon$  shown in the Table.

5. Using rational map ansatz as starting configurations we have calculated the static characteristics of bound skyrmions with baryon numbers up to 8. The excitation frequencies for different flavours - strangeness, charm and bottom - have been calculated using a rigid oscillator version of the bound state approach of the chiral soliton models. This variant of the model overestimates the mass splitting of strange hyperons when  $FSB$  in decay constant  $F_K$  is included, but works better for  $c$  and  $b$  flavours [18]. Our previous conclusion that  $BS$  with charm and bottom have more chances to be bound respectively to strong decay than strange  $BS$  [15] is reinforced by the present investigation. This conclusion takes place also in  $FS$  case,  $F_D = F_\pi$ .

Consideration of the  $BS$  with “mixed” flavours is possible in principle, but would be technically more involved. Our results agree qualitatively with the results of [22] where the strangeness excitation frequencies had been calculated within the bound state approach. The difference is, however, in the behaviour of excitation frequencies: we have found that they decrease when the baryon number increases from  $B = 1$  thus increasing the binding energy of corresponding  $BS$ .

The charmed baryonic systems with  $B = 3, 4$  were considered in [23] within a potential approach. The  $B = 3$  systems were found to be very near the threshold and the  $B = 4$  system was found to be stable with respect to the strong decay, with a binding energy of  $\sim 10$  *Mev*. Further experimental searches for the baryonic systems with flavour different from  $u$  and  $d$  could shed more light on the dynamics of heavy flavours in baryonic systems.

This work has been supported by the UK PPARC grant: PPA/V/S/1999/00004. VBK is indebted to the Institute for Nuclear Theory at the University of Washington where the work was initiated for its hospitality and DOE for support.

## References

1. T.H.R. Skyrme, Proc.Roy.Soc., London, A260,127 (1961); Nucl.Phys. 31, 556 (1962)
2. C. Houghton, N. Manton, P. Sutcliffe, Nucl. Phys. B510, 507 (1998)
3. T. Ioannidou, B. Piette, W.J. Zakrzewski, hep-th/9811071; Preprint DTP98/51 UKC98/42
4. E. Braaten, S. Townsend, L. Carson, Phys.Lett. B235,147 (1990)
5. R.A. Battye, P.M. Sutcliffe, Phys.Lett. B391, 150 (1997); Phys.Rev.Lett. 79, 363 (1997)
6. V.B. Kopeliovich, B. Schwesinger, B.E. Stern, JETP Lett. 62, 185 (1995)
7. B. Schwesinger, H. Weigel, Phys. Lett. B267, 438 (1991); H. Weigel, Int.J.Mod.Phys. A11, 2419 (1996)
8. E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B223, 422; 433 (1983)
9. G.S. Adkins, C.R. Nappi, E. Witten, Nucl.Phys. B228,552 (1983); G.S. Adkins, C.R. Nappi, Nucl.Phys. B233, 109 (1984); G. Guadagnini, Nucl.Phys. B236, 35 (1984)
10. R.L. Jaffe, C.L. Korpa, Nucl. Phys. B258, 468 (1985); A.P. Balachandran et al, Nucl. Phys. B256, 525 (1985)
11. C.G. Callan, I.R. Klebanov, Nucl. Phys. B262,365 (1985)
12. N. Scoccola et al, Phys. Lett. B201, 425 (1988); C.G. Callan, K. Hornbostel, I.R. Klebanov, Phys.Lett. B202, 269 (1988); N. Scoccola et al, Nucl. Phys. A505, 497 (1989)
13. D. Kaplan, I.R. Klebanov, Nucl.Phys. B335,45 (1990)

14. K.M. Westerberg, I.R. Klebanov, Phys. Rev. D50, 5834 (1994); I.R. Klebanov, K.M. Westerberg, Phys.Rev. D53, 2804 (1996)
15. V.B. Kopeliovich, JETP Lett. 67, 896 (1998); hep-ph/9805296
16. V.B. Kopeliovich, B. Schwesinger, B.E. Stern, Nucl.Phys. A549, 485 (1992); V.B. Kopeliovich, Phys.Lett. 259B, 234 (1991)
17. V.B. Kopeliovich, Nucl. Phys. A639, 75c (1998); JETP 85, 1060(1997); Phys. Atom.Nucl. 56, 1084 (1993)
18. D.O. Riska, N.N. Scoccola, Phys.Lett. B265, 188 (1991); M. Bjornberg et al, Nucl.Phys. A539, 662 (1992)
19. V.B. Kopeliovich, B.E. Stern, JETP Lett. 45, 203 (1987); NORDITA-preprint 89-34, Copenhagen (1989)
20. S. Kabana et al. J.Phys. G23, 2135 (1997)
21. B. Moussalam, Ann. of Phys. (N.Y.) 225, 264 (1993); H. Walliser, Phys. Lett. B432, 15 (1998); N. Scoccola, H. Walliser, hep-ph/9805340; Phys. Rev. D58: 094037 (1998)
22. M. Schvellinger, N.N. Scoccola, Phys. Lett. B430, 32 (1998)
23. B.F. Gibson et al, Phys. Rev. C27, 2085 (1983)